

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>STEVEN PANNEBAKER,</b>	:	<b>CIV NO. 1:21-CV-2168</b>
	:	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>v.</b>	:	<b>(Magistrate Judge Carlson)</b>
	:	
<b>KARIN TROTTA, et al.,</b>	:	
	:	
<b>Defendants.</b>	:	

**MEMORANDUM ORDER**

In this action, the *pro se* plaintiff has filed a motion which sought to compel the production of certain discovery, stating that the defendants had failed to respond to the discovery propounded upon them. (Doc. 31). The defendants have responded to this motion, advising the Court that they have today provided the plaintiff responses to his outstanding discovery requests. (Doc. 42).

In light of this reply, we conclude that this motion to compel is moot. The mootness doctrine recognizes a fundamental truth in litigation: “[i]f developments occur during the course of adjudication that eliminate a plaintiff’s personal stake in the outcome of a suit or prevent a court from being able to grant the requested relief, the case must be dismissed as moot.” Blanciak v. Allegheny Ludlum Corp., 77 F.3d 690, 698-99 (3d Cir. 1996). Since these defendants have now replied to these discovery demands, any request for an order directing a response to these discovery requests is now moot. Of course, if upon receipt of the responses Mr.

Pannebaker seeks to compel further information he may endeavor to do so by a separate motion. Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, and this motion to compel, (Doc. 31), is DEEMED MOOT.

So ordered this 23d day of September 2022.

*S/Martin C. Carlson*

Martin C. Carlson

United States Magistrate Judge